

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)
US APPLICATION NO. 09/762,945
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q80251

REMARKS

Applicant's Statement of Substance of Interview

Applicants wish to express appreciation to Vikkram Bali for the courtesy of a personal interview which was granted to Applicant's representative Michael Faibisch (Reg. No. 48,427) at the USPTO on April 13, 2005. The Examiner's statement of the substance of the interview is set forth in the Interview Summary, numbered Paper No. 20050413. During the interview, Claim 1 was discussed vis-à-vis the Luke and Bishop references. In the interview, Applicants' representative pointed out that none of the references show or suggest determining the presence of oxidized metal on a conductor from an analysis of an image.

General Remarks

Claims 1 - 18 and 23 are pending in the application. Claims 1 - 4, 6, 12, 13, 17, 18 and 23 are currently amended. Claims 2 - 4, 6, 12, 13, 17, 18 and 23 include self-explanatory corrections to adopt terminology introduced in amended claim 1.

Applicant has carefully studied the outstanding Office Action in the present application. The present amendment is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner in the Office Action mailed January 19, 2005, and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of all claims under consideration is respectfully requested.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1 - 13, 17 - 18 and 23 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Luke et al. (US 5,483,603) in view of Bishop et al. (US 5,524,152). Claims 14 - 16 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Luke et al. (US 5,483,603) in view of Bishop et al. (US 5,524,152) and further in view of Brecher et al. (5,544,256).

Luke et al. describes a system and method for automatic optical inspection. Bishop et al. describes a method of and apparatus for object or surface inspection employing multicolor reflection discrimination. Brecher et al. describes an automated defect classification system.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)
US APPLICATION NO. 09/762,945
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q80251

Claim 1 has been amended and now recites:

generating a pixelated image of the printed circuit board, said printed circuit board comprising a laminate and a plurality of metal conductors; and

determining the presence of oxidized metal on a conductor from an analysis of the image

As noted in the interview held at the USPTO on April 13, 2005, nothing in the Luke, Bishop or Brecher references shows or suggests determining the presence of oxidized metal on a conductor from an analysis of an image. The combined teachings of these three documents, even if taken together for what they would have meant as a whole to an artisan of ordinary skill, fail to meet the above-identified requirements of the claims as now amended. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 1, and all of its dependent claims 2 - 18 and 23, under 35 USC §103(a).

Conclusion and Request for Interview

In view of the foregoing, this application is believed to be in order. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)
US APPLICATION NO. 09/762,945
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q80251

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

/Kelly G. Hyndman/
Kelly G. Hyndman
Registration No. 39,234

Date: May 11, 2005